

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,955	NAITO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ngoclan T. Mai	1742	

All Participants:

Status of Application: non final

(1) Ngoclan T. Mai.

(3) _____

(2) Abraham Rosner.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 December 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Ngoclan T. Mai
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon further consideration although the amendment and response filed 10/11/05 overcomes the rejection over WO00/15555, the claims are rejectable for obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious over the claims of US patent 6,663,687 in view of Fife (U.S. Patent No. 6,051,044). To avoid this rejection and to put the application in condition for allowance, applicant is advised to file a terminal disclaimer.